IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

FRIDAY, THE 16TH NOVEMBER 2007 / 25TH KARTHIKA 1929

WP(C).No. 33915 of 2007(K)

PETITIONER:

REGIMOL PHILIP,
MUNDATTUCHUNDAYIL HOUSE, EDAMATTOM P.O.,
MEENACHIL, PALA - VIA, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.BABU JOSEPH KURUVATHAZHA

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. STATE OF KERALA, REP. BY
ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEPT. OF GENERAL
EDUCATION, GOVT. SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE ASSISTANT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,
ETTUMANOOR, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

3. JULIET MATHEW,
AMMANATHUKUNNEL HOUSE, CHERPUNKAL, PALA - VIA,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

4. THE MANAGER,
ST. JOSEPH'S L.P.SCHOOL, KUMMANNOOR,
CHERPUNKAL P.O., PALA - VIA, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

BY GOVT. PLEADER, SRI.A.J.VARGHESE

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 16/11/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

S.SIRI JAGAN, J.

==========

W.P.(C) No. 33915 of 2007(K)

==========

Dated this the 16th day of November, 2007

JUDGMENT

Claiming appointment in a vacancy of LPSA, which arose in the school managed by the 4th respondent, on 1.6.07, the petitioner filed Ext. P5 application. However, overlooking the claim of the petitioner the 4th respondent appointed the 3rd respondent by Ext.P6 order. According to the petitioner the petitioner has another claim also for appointment in an earlier vacancy which claim is pending in appeal before the Supreme Court of India in SLP(Civil) No.2913/04, as against one Smt.Tessi Joseph who was also appointed overlooking the petitioner. The petitioner therefore filed Exts. P7 to P9 before the 2nd respondent. The petitioner seeks expeditious disposal of Exts. P7 to P9.

2. I have heard the learned Government Pleader. In the facts and circumstances of the case, there would be a direction to

the 2nd respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Exts. P7 to P9 in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment after affording an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner as well as respondents 3 and 4. I make it clear that I have not considered the entitlement of the petitioner for reliefs prayed for in Exts. P7 to P9 on merits and it would be open to the 2nd respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on the same in accordance with law on merits.

The writ petition is disposed of as above.

S.SIRI JAGAN,
JUDGE

jp